



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

February 2013



Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project

Preliminary Environmental Assessment 30-day Comment Period Comment Content Analysis and Response to Comments

**Manchester Ranger District
Green Mountain National Forest
Towns of Dorset, Peru, Manchester and Winhall;
Bennington County, VT**



Dorset Peak Vista

For Information Contact: Melissa Reichert
Project Team Leader
Green Mountain National Forest
Supervisor's Office
231 North Main Street
Rutland, VT 05701
(802)747-6754
FAX (802)747-6766
[E-mail: mmreichert@fs.fed.us](mailto:mmreichert@fs.fed.us)

Responsible Official: William F. Jackson
District Ranger
Manchester Ranger District
2538 Depot Street
Manchester, VT 05255
(802)362-2307, ext 212
FAX (802)362-1251
[E-mail: wfjackson@fs.fed.us](mailto:wfjackson@fs.fed.us)

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political affiliation, sexual orientation, and marital or familial status (not all prohibited bases apply to all programs). Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication or program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact the USDA's TARGET Center at 202/720-2600 (voice or TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write the USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, Washington, DC, 20250-9410 or call 202/720-5964 (voice or TDD). The USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

This document can be made available in large print.
Contact Melissa Reichert (802)747-6754 or
email: mmreichert@fs.fed.u

DORSET PERU INTEGRATED RESOURCE PROJECT
Preliminary Environmental Assessment 30-Day Comment Period:
Comment Content Analysis and Response to Comments

This document provides the content analysis of public comments received in response to the *Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project Preliminary Environmental Assessment: 30-Day Comment Document* (preliminary EA) dated August 2012. It also provides the Forest Service response to specific issues raised by the comments received. These issues were used to determine the changes, new information and/or additional analysis documented in the *Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project Final Environmental Assessment* dated February 2013.

Issues were developed by the Forest Service Dorset Peru Project interdisciplinary team (IDT) from written correspondence and telephone conversations in response to the preliminary EA during the 30-day notice and comment period. Preliminary EA comments (including letters, emails and recorded verbal communication) are located in the project planning record identified with a unique document number. In addition, each issue contained within the comment documents has an identifying number, for example, 11-3 is issue #3 in document #11.

The following are the comment document number and comment sources.

Document #	Comment Source
1	Dick Artley
2	Clayton and Suzanne Rose
3	Gerald Rose
4	Gilbert and Cindy Henyon
5	Karen Borgia
6	Allen and Janet Kirk
7	John Lareau
8	Tom Linell
9	Frederick Oneil
10	Victor Rolando
11	Mitchell and Meredith Saltzman
12	Tim Ward
13	Peter Bradford
14	Tom Linell

Definition of Issues

An issue is defined as a point of disagreement, debate, or dispute over a proposed action based on anticipated environmental effects. During the Preliminary EA comments content analysis process, the IDT determined what category to separate the issues into: 1) major issues; or 2) other issues.

1. Major Issues: These are issues that represent unresolved conflicts associated with the proposed action and are addressed with the development of an alternative(s) and/or mitigation measure(s). Alternatives provide a clear difference in environmental effects associated with the major issue. Issues can be identified as major because of the extent of their geographic distribution, the duration of their effects, or the intensity of interest or resource conflict. Major issues meet the intent of the Council for Environmental Quality

(CEQ) NEPA regulations at 40 CFR Sec. 1500.1(b) and 1500.4(g), "...NEPA documents must concentrate on the issues that are truly significant..." and "...deserving of study..."

2. Other Issues: These are issues that are not addressed in the environmental analysis or are only briefly discussed. The CEQ NEPA regulations require this delineation in 40 CFR Sec. 1501.7(a) (3.), "...identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review ..." These non-significant issues are defined as "other" issues in the EA. Sub-categories of other issues include:
 - a) The issue is outside the scope of the proposed action.
 - b) The issue is already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level decision.
 - c) The issue is irrelevant to the decision to be made.
 - d) The issue is conjectural and not supported by scientific or factual evidence.
 - e) Comments that identify an issue that has already been addressed in the analysis.
3. Non-Issues: Many comments received at this stage of the analysis are not categorized as issues even if they may lead to improvements to the proposed action or Final EA document; because they are not considered a point of disagreement, debate, or dispute over the proposed action based on anticipated environmental effects. These comments are defined as "non-issues". Sub-categories of non-issues include:
 - a) Comments that indicate that information presented in the document may need to be clarified because it is unclear or confusing.
 - b) Comments that lead to editorial corrections, address incorrect or outdated information, or improve the document format so that it is more easily understood.
 - c) Comments that ask specific, general or unrelated questions; seek clarification; or request information.
 - d) Comments that provide unsubstantiated opinions, state a preferred alternative without leading to a new issue, or express general opposition or support.
 - e) Comments that identify an issue that has already been addressed in the analysis.
 - f) Comments that suggest opportunities for public collaboration.

Comment Content Analysis Process

During the content analysis process, comments were summarized by an issue statement, and then grouped into resource areas for each respective issue category. Issue statements describe a clear cause and effect relationship between the proposed management activities and some resource consequence. An effort was made to capture as many similar issues as possible with one issue statement. Issue statements were given a public concern (PC) or sub-concern (SC) number under each resource area (in the left hand column) so that they can be more easily tracked. The identifying comment number(s) are also provided following each issue statement so their source can be readily referenced for its full text in each respective comment document.

Each issue statement is followed with the Forest Service response to document how it was addressed in the analysis process.

MAJOR ISSUES

Transportation System Management

PC 41000-01 Trails Management	The Forest Service should reconsider locating the Emerald Lake Connector Trail on lands between the Mad Tom Trail and Mad Tom Road because of its proximity to private land. (9-1).
Response: The proposed Emerald Lake Connector Trail would be a hiking trail located approximately one quarter mile from the commenters land on Mad Tom Road. Refer to the Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) Alternative B Proposed Action 2.1.2. Recreation p. 38, Recreation Section 3.2.4.2, p. 64 to 67; and Maps 3 and 4. A mitigation measure has been added to Appendix B, "R-6. Forest Service staff will work with adjacent property owners when determining an alignment for the Emerald Lake Connector Trail." Refer to Appendix B, Mitigation Measures Recreation, p. B-2.	

OTHER ISSUES

Natural Resources Management

PC 30200-01 Soils Management	The Forest Service should reconsider allowing the use of skidders and tractors because soils are fragile. (1-4)
Response: Skidders and other types of heavy equipment would be used to harvest trees. The effects of this equipment on soils are disclosed in the Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA), Section 3.8 - Soil and Wetlands. Additional information on the impacts of harvesting on soil exists in the Green Mountain National Forest Final Environmental Impact Statement (FS 2006), pages 3-25 through 32. To summarize this information, application of Vermont's Acceptable Management Practices (AMPs), along with Forest Plan S&Gs for Soil, Water and Riparian Area Protection and Restoration (see Plan, page 20-22), have repeatedly been shown to be effective in keeping soil erosion, compaction, and impacts to wetlands at low levels on the GMNF. For example, Soil Disturbance Monitoring in past harvest areas in and near the Dorset Peru IRP showed that soil productivity was largely unaffected by past harvests. Monitoring also showed soil erosion and rutting were minor impacts.	
PC 32000-01 Timber Management	The Forest Service should reconsider commercial timber harvest
SC-1	Because logging does not reestablish healthy forests; and improve of enhance habitat diversity, fisheries, soil and water, recreation, scenery, and heritage resources. (1-2,1-6).
Response: Timber management is one of the tools the Forest Service uses to move resource conditions toward Forest Plan goals and objectives. Timber Management was analyzed in the 2006 Green Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), Section 3.13 Timber Management, pp. 3-277 to 3-291. Goal 2 of the revised Forest Plan (p. 10) is to maintain and restore quality, amount, and distribution of habitats to produce viable and sustainable populations of native and desirable non-native plants and animals. Goal 8 and its objectives of the revised Forest Plan (p. 14) are to provide for a sustainable supply of forest products, including high-quality sawtimber and other wood products for local economies. Refer to Forest Plan FEIS, Appendix H, PC 34000-12, pp. H-176 and H-177. The No Action Alternative does not propose commercial timber harvest in the	

project area and was analyzed in the Final EA.	
SC-2	Because logging roads-up the area.(1-3)
Response: See response to PC 40000-02 and PC 10000-04 SC 5.	
SC-3	Because there is no shortage of timber products in America. (1-13)
Response: The comment is outside the scope of this analysis and is conjectural. The stated purpose and need for this project includes meeting timber harvest direction as approved in Forest Plan Goals and Objectives, refer to the Final EA Section 1.3 Purpose and Need, p. 6.	

Transportation System Management

PC 40000-02 Roads Management	The Forest Service should address the impacts of roads in logging operations such as adding sedimentation in streams, fragmenting wildlife habitat and providing vehicular access to parts of the forest that should only be reached by foot or horseback.(1-5).
Response: Analysis of the effects of soil erosion and risk of sedimentation is described in the Final EA Soil and Wetlands Section3.9.4.2. Regarding sedimentation to streams, monitoring conducted on the GMNF has shown that when standards, guidelines and mitigation measures are applied to ground disturbing activities including logging, that sedimentation is minimal and aquatic biota are not negatively impacted.	
PC 41000-03 Trails Management	The Forest Service should not allow mountain bikes on the Dorset Mountain Trail due to the steeper and higher elevation. (14-2)
Response: The Dorset Mountain Trail from Grouse Lane to the Dorset Mountain ridge will be designed and constructed to accommodate mountain bikes using a switchback design with a gradient of six to ten percent. The Forest Service has worked with the Vermont Mountain Biking Association to design and construct similar trails on Chandler Ridge and Leicester Hollow. Trails constructed with a “purpose built” design have proven to be sustainable on the type of terrain on Dorset Mountain.	

NON-ISSUES

Processes

PC 10000-01 Decision- making process	The Forest Service should reconsider the responses to objections about using Bromley Forest and Chandolin Roads for the transport of logs because the responses are not relevant to concerns and the area is only 5% of the project. (11-1)
Response: Concerns regarding use of Bromley Forest and Chandolin Roads for timber haul and stated objections have been considered in the analysis and have been addressed in the development of Alternative C. Refer to the Final EA Section 2.1.3 Alternative C, p.42.	
PC 10000-02	The Forest Service has provided documentation to address many concerns in the EA but none of the concerns reach the height of public safety. (2-13) (6-1)
Response: Public safety is also very important to the Forest Service and was addressed in the Decision Notice and Final EA. Refer to the Final EA Section 3.1.4 Direct and Indirect Effects, pp.56 and 57 and Decision Notice and Findings of No Significant Impact (DN/FONSI) pp 7 and 8. These roads are under the jurisdiction of the Town of Winhall, and any use by logging operators shall be consistent with Town rules and regulations. The Town of Winhall Select Board did not indicate any public safety threats or any objection to the use of these roads for	

hauling timber. The use of these Town (public) roads by logging operators under contract with the Forest Service is consistent with use by other private and public operators on these and other similar Town (public) roads.	
PC 10000-03	EA speaks to issues of scenery and vistas located within the FS property which may be affected by implementation of commercial logging. The EA addresses the selected thinning and feathering techniques that would be implemented to provide good ridge line viewing, these issues pale when compared to our public safety concerns on Bromley Forest and Chandolin Roads. (2-12)
Response: See response to PC 10000-02 above.	
PC 10000-04	Forest Service should include opposing views source documents in the reference section of the EA
SC-1	Because they describe the environmental effects from timber sales to countless natural resources and the resource damage. (1-7)
SC-2	Because it violates the law to give the public a skewed look versus a "hard look." (1-8)
SC-3	Because citing USFS employee authored literature to support the project and rejecting non-USFS authored literature that explains massive resource damage is unethical. (1-9)
SC-4	Because the opposing views source documents in Attachment #1 were authored and/or signed by 237 unbiased PhD biological scientists with no connection to the USDA and 77% of the source documents listed in the References section of this preliminary EA that drove the project are authored by USDA employees with financial incentives to portray logging as ecosystem-friendly. (1-10)
SC-5	Because the opposing views source documents in Attachment #4 were authored and/or signed by 52 unbiased PhD biological scientists with no connection to the USDA and 77% of the source documents listed in the References section of this preliminary EA that drove the project are authored by USDA employees with financial incentives to portray road-construct as ecosystem-benign. (1-11)
<p>Response: The District Ranger and the Interdisciplinary Team have considered all information provided in the attachments sent by the commenter. These documents were considered as potentially useful information to guide the analysis and the decision. Only some of the documents were peer-reviewed scientific literature; many were opinion documents, and many were web-sites. Some of the literature listed by the commenter is included as references in the 2006 Forest Plan FEIS. Most of the submitted documents describe commonly recognized impacts that can result from forest management activities. The GMNF staff is aware of this information, recognizes that these potential impacts can exist in certain environments and landscapes, and considers them in the decision-making process.</p> <p>GMNF staff design projects to implement the Forest Plan and comply with Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines as well as state and federal regulations. The analysis for this project is tiered to the FEIS for the 2006 GMNF Forest Plan. The FEIS identified the potential impacts from forest management activities at a programmatic scale. Based on relevant scientific information documented in that FEIS, a wide-variety of goals, objectives, and standards and guidelines were incorporated into the Forest Plan to reduce adverse effects.</p> <p>At the project level, GMNF staff considers applicable relevant scientific information and opposing views. Identifying scientific information that would be relevant specifically to the project area and local conditions is a main concern. GMNF staff also identify and consider</p>	

applicable information that differs from Agency guidance or Forest Plan direction, and any information that would lead the decision maker to develop additional alternatives. Refer to the Final EA, Chapter 3, Effected Environment and Environmental Consequences for effects the proposed action may have on forest resources, as current and relevant science.

Alternatives/Options

PC 21000-01 Alternatives General	The Forest Service should reconsider implementing the proposed action and the alternatives because of the potential environmental impacts of damage to roadways and public safety exposures associated with proposed logging operations. (2-2)
Response: Potential environmental impacts associated with proposed logging was disclosed in Chapter 3 of the EA. Adherence to Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines, approved mitigation measures, Best Management Practices, applicable federal, state and local rules and regulations and logging operation contract requirements will eliminate or reduce potential impacts.	
PC 21000-02	Looking forward to some nice hiking and mountain biking out my back door. (12-1)
Response: Comment noted.	
PC 21100-01 Alternative Development/ Method/Range	The Forest Service correctly addresses our concerns regarding the anticipated damage to our roads and significant public safety issues, correctly inserted our safety concern into the Major Issue category, correctly addressed our concerns in Chapter 2 and the Alternatives provide a clear basis for choice. (2-8)
Response: Comment noted.	
PC 211000-02	Alternative A no-action and Alternative C state that under Alternative A and C no timber harvest would occur in Harvest Zone 3 and no logging trucks would use Chandolin and Bromley Forest Roads to haul timber. (2-9)
Response: Comment noted.	
PC 21410-01 Alternative A and PC 21430-01 Alternative C	Alternatives A and C appear to address safety concerns regarding timber hauling on Chandolin and Bromley Forest Roads. Would Chandolin and Bromley Forest Roads be used for timber harvesting equipment such as fell skidders, feller/buncher-skidder-processor and cut to length access to NF lands under Alternatives A and C? (2-10)
Response: Bromley Forest Road and Chandolin Road provide vehicle access to National Forest Lands. This access may include transport of timber harvesting equipment or other equipment needed to construct log landings or skid trails, such as an excavator or bulldozer. Alternatives A and C do not propose timber harvesting in the area that requires access using Bromley Forest and Chandolin Roads so most likely the roads would not be needed for harvesting equipment access. Refer to the Final EA Sections 2.1.1 Alternative A, p. 25, and Section 2.1.3 Alternative C, p. 43.	
PC 21420-01 Alternative B	The Forest Service should reconsider implementing the Proposed Action because it will harm the natural resources in and downstream from the project area (1-12)
Response: By following Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines and implementing mitigation measures, the impacts to stream habitat and biota that can result from sedimentation and increased temperature will be avoided. Response to PC 40000-02 addresses sedimentation risk. Stream temperatures will not be impacted because Forest Plan Standards require a forested buffer remain along all stream courses. Proposed activities involving large wood restoration and aquatic organism passage will in fact improve stream habitat, habitat connectivity, geomorphic processes and reduce the risk of catastrophic failure of smaller culverts that can have severe impacts on downstream habitat. Refer to the Final EA Fisheries	

and Water Section 3.10.4, pp. 118 to 121.	
PC 21420-02	The Forest Service should not implement the proposed action
SC-1	Because it will result in the deterioration of our residential community. (2-1)
SC-2	Because it will cause health problems. (2-1)
SC-3	Because it will ruin the roads used to access our homes. (2-1)
SC-4	Because it would threaten public safety due to the logging operations (2-2)
SC-5	Because the mitigation measures provide little or no abatement regarding damage to roadways and safety of neighborhood residents (2-5)
Response: Comment noted. The concern is addressed with the development of Alternative C to eliminate timber harvesting in C59/S15 and 18, C60/S35, 36, and 37 and through mitigations in the Proposed Action. Refer to the Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA), Major Issues Section 1.7.1, pp. 24 and 25; Alternative C Section 2.1.3, p. 43, Social Section 3.1.4.2, pp. 56 and 57, and Appendix B, Mitigation Measures Social Factors, p. B-1. Timber harvest under the Proposed Action will be conducted during winter months when frozen ground conditions will minimize road damage. Bromley Forest Road is a Class 3 Road maintained by the Town of Winhall. The Forest Service is working with the Town to address any concerns related to road maintenance.	
PC 21410-02 and PC 21430-02	Alternative A and Alternative C are the practical and sensible decision because the addition of vehicle trips by the logging trucks and the loggers working at the site make a perfect situation for something bad to happen. (2-11)
Response: We do not consider loggers working on public lands and logging truck access on these Town roads any different from similar activities (public or private) on other Town or State roads in Vermont that are managed according to governing rules and regulations.	
PC 21430-03 Alternative C	The Forest Service should choose Alternative C
SC-1	Because of safety issues related to Bromley Forest Road width, pedestrians, and children at play. (4-4)
SC-2	Because Bromley Forest Road has periodic thaws. (4-4)
SC-3	Because of the noise of the trucks and logging equipment. (4-4)
SC-4	Because the thin soils and steep grades make logging difficult if not unprofitable and would be detrimental to the environment. (4-4)
SC-5	Because it would eliminate the need for access over Bromley Forest and Chandolin Roads. (11-5)
Response: Comment noted.	

Natural Resources Management

PC 30000-01 Physical elements Management	The Forest Service should not propose long term harm to natural resources using tax dollars to prepare this corporate friendly project. (1-1)
Response: .This project meets the intent of the Forest Plan and as proposed will comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations. See PC 32000-01 SC-1	
PC 30120-02 Riparian	Commenter commends the GMNF for opposing berms as a supposed means of "flood prevention. Berms constrict flow, which increases stream velocity, which in flood time is not a wise management goal." (8-1)
Response: Thank you for the commendation.	
PC 32000-02	The Forest Service should not manipulate conifer trees to emulate

Timber	private/industrial tree farms. (1-15)
Response: The Dorset Peru project is proposing a variety of treatments, many of which are intended to increase the proportion of conifers and many of which are intended to promote uneven-aged management.	
PC 32000-03	Commenter would appreciate extra wood lying around so he could harvest it for his woodstove. (12-2)
Response: Firewood (dead and down wood) is available for cutting before a timber sale is sold in the area and after it closes. After timber harvest, it is recommended the commenter check with the Manchester Ranger District office to find out when the timber sale is closed and the area is available for firewood cutting.	

Other Resources Management

PC 38000-01	Commenter states East Dorset Blast furnace referenced on page 33 is not owned by the State. (10-1)
Response: The commenter correctly observed that the furnace which is proposed to be worked on was mis-stated. The correct reference is to the NORTH Dorset Blast furnace (#VT-BE-35) owned and managed by the Emerald Lake State Park.	
PC 38000-02	Commenter states that response to Scoping Comment PC 81000-04 is incorrect. You are discussing two separate blast furnaces one on Benedict Road and the other at Emerald Lake State. (10-2)
Response: See PC 38000-01.	
PC 38000-03	Commenter suggests on page 128 to change to read the blast furnaces and mill. (10-3).
Response: Comment noted.	

Transportation System Management

PC 40000-01 Roads Management	The Forest Service should reconsider using Bromley Forest Road for use by log trucks and harvest equipment.
SC-1	Because it is a small one lane dirt road that cannot handle trucks, noise and congestion(6-1)
SC-2	Because of the potential damage to the gravel road base(2-3)
SC-3	Because the road is only 18 feet across at the crown and the useable portion of the road diminishes in winter due to snow accumulation making it barely wide enough for two cars to pass. (2-6, 11-2,)
Response: The use of this Town (public) road by logging operators under contract with the Forest Service is consistent with recent and past use by other private and public operators on this and other similar Town (public) roads. The Town of Winhall has not objected to the use of these roads for hauling timber.	
PC 40100-01 Safety	The Forest Service should reconsider using Bromley Forest Road and Chandolin Road for use by log trucks and harvest equipment
SC-1	Because the logging in the winter will include ski season when there will be a maximum of families using the road. (2-7, 4-2)
SC-2	Because it would result in significant public safety issues, especially for children who live along the road. (11-2)
SC-3	Because it would result in noise. (4-2)
SC-4	Because the addition of vehicle trips by the logging trucks and the loggers

	working at the site make a perfect situation for something bad to happen. (2-11)
SC-5	Because the entrance onto Route 11/30 from Bromley Forest Road is in an area with steep grades and two curves that is used by skiers. 4-3)
SC-6	Because the descent onto Route 11/30 is steep, often slippery and would be difficult for logging trucks to navigate.(11-4)
SC-7	Because the road can be icy in the winter due to back-up of ditches. (11-2)
SC-8	Because there is a sharp turn when descending Chandolin Road and turning onto Bromley Forest Road that would be difficult for a logging truck to navigate. (11-3)
Response: The use of these Town (public) roads by logging operators under contract with the Forest Service is consistent with recent and past use by other private and public operators on these and other similar Town (public) roads. These roads are under the jurisdiction of the Town of Winhall, and any use by logging operators shall be consistent with Town rules and regulations. The Town of Winhall has not objected to the use of these roads for hauling timber. Logging trucks already utilize Route 11/30, a State road.	
PC 41000-02 Trails Management	The Forest Service should consider adding a trail to Bromley Mountain from the proposed East Dorset and Mad Tom Trails. (7-1).
Response: The Appalachian National Scenic Trail (AT) goes from Bromley Mountain to FR 21. The proposed East Dorset Trail and the existing Mad Tom Trail connect with FR 21 a short distance from the AT. The commenter's proposed trail would provide a shortcut from Bromley Mountain to the proposed East Dorset Trail and the existing Mad Tom Trail. At this time the Forest Service would like to focus on the re-establishment of the East Dorset Trail due to the public desire to restore this trail and the Forest Service's limited budget and capacity. Refer to the Final EA Alternative B Proposed Action 2.1.2. Recreation p. 37, Recreation Section 3.2.4.2, pp. 61-63; and Maps 3 and 4.	
PC 41000-04	The commenter supports the East Dorset Trail being pedestrian only. (14-1)
Response: Comment noted.	

Social and Economic

PC 70000-01	The Forest Service appears to misunderstand the density and occupancy of the homes on Bromley Forest and Chandolin Roads during the winter months. While several of the homes are occupied as full time residences and several are frequently occupied as second homes, the Bromley Forest neighborhood changes significantly during the winter months with additional family occupancies including small children, enjoying the many winter recreational opportunities. (2-4)
Response: The Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project Final Environmental Assessment (Final EA) Social Section 3.1.3 Affected Environment, p. 56, describes the Bromley Forest development with the number of homes and the estimated vehicle trips per day. This concern is addressed with the development of Alternative C to eliminate timber harvesting in C59/S15 and 18, C60/S35, 36, and 37 and through mitigations in the Proposed Action. Refer to the Dorset Peru Integrated Resource Project Final EA, Major Issues Section 1.7.1, pp. 24 and 25; Alternative C Section 2.1.3, p. 43, Social Section 3.1.4.2 pp. 56 and 57, and Appendix B, Mitigation Measures Social Factors, p. B-1.	
SF-1 Temporary traffic controls will be used that provide road users with adequate warning of hazardous or potentially hazardous conditions associated with timber harvesting operations.	
SF-3 Forest Service staff will work with the Town of Winhall to develop any appropriate	

restrictions to hauling activities on Chandolin and Bromley Forest Roads. Restrictions to be considered include:

- No hauling activities on weekends and federal holidays.
- No or restricted hauling activities during school bus pick-up and drop-off times.
- Keeping town road plowed to the widest extent possible.

Questions, Clarifications and Corrections

PC 80000-01 General	Owners of East Dorset Tax Parcel 16-00-015.000 on Beech Ridge would like the Forest Service to clarify the reference on page 39 of the Preliminary Environmental Assessment about NFSR 285 to decommission in the database and the existing gate and other access issues as it may pertain to their parcel. (3-1)
Response: Decommissioning would only be as a NFS Road in the Forest Service database. The Town Road would continue to exist. No physical work to obliterate the road would take place. Access to the referenced parcel of land is provided via East Beech Ridge Road to the south of the referenced parcel.	
PC 80000-02	Commenter is willing to put a trail crew together to keep all the trails open. (7-2)
Response: Thank you for the offer. The Forest Service works with many partners who assist in maintaining trails, and looks forward to partner assistance to maintain the proposed trails.	
PC 80000-03	Commenter requests a more detailed explanation of the Pierce Road Extension that is mentioned on page 37. What is the route of this extension expected to be and what is the purpose. There is no obvious need for "soil and wetland rehabilitation work" extending a mile beyond the end of the current Pierce Road. (13-2)
Response: Minor improvements are needed on the old road continuing north from the end of Pierce Road so that it can be used by logging trucks. The road could access up to three landings in Compartment 62 – one just north Pierce Road and the National Forest Boundary, and the other two landings (to the north) in or near stands 1 or 2. The old road needs additional culverts, dips and ditching, and existing culverts must be cleaned out. Some gravel would also be needed to harden soft portions of the road, and a skidder bridge would be installed over a stream. These measures would provide a road suitable for hauling while best protecting nearby streams. No improvements are planned on Pierce Road itself south of the National Forest boundary.	
PC 81000-01 Requests	Commenter wants to know whom to make a plea for a tax adjustment to reflect negative changes made to her property value resulting from dredging throughout our 10 acres, and the implementation of power lines to service new neighbors along Mad Tom Notch Road. (5-1)
Response: Property tax appraisals are under town jurisdiction. Please contact your town clerk for information.	
PC 81000-02	Commenter suggests adding APE and CCC to the Chapter 6 Abbreviations and Acronyms. (10-4)
Response: Comment noted. Refer to Final EA Chapter 6, p. 148	